

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-23 were presented. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 8, 14 and 19 are amended, and claim 15 is canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-14 and 16-23 are now pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3, 6-13, 16, 18 and 21-23 is noted and appreciated.

Claim Objections

Claims 8 and 14 are objected to for grammatical informalities. The noted informalities are corrected.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 14, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Zagrodnik et al. (US 6,053,626) (“Zagrodnik”). In response, independent claims 1 and 14 are amended to clearly distinguish over Zagrodnick. Since the limitations of claim 15 are now included in claim 14, claim 15 is canceled.

Claims 1 and 14, as amended, require that a metal stay bracket be attached to the rear fender, and that a metal flasher stay be attached to the metal stay bracket through a gasket (83). This provides a significant advantage in that vibration from the rear fender (12) will not be transmitted to flasher stay (80), and the flasher stay will not be broken.

In Zagrodnik, conversely, light bar assembly 34 is directly attached to rear fender 18, and does not provide the same effect as in applicant’s invention. Vibration from rear fender 18 will be transmitted to light bar assembly 34.

Since Zagrodnik does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 1 and 14, as amended, Zagrodnik cannot anticipate claims 1 and 14, or claims 2, 4, 5, 17 and 19 dependent thereon. With respect to dependent claims 5 and 19, as amended,

Appl. No. 10/624,430
Amtd. Dated April 13, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 89277.0005
Customer No. 26021

applicant further notes that the flasher stay is very strong as it is made by pressing metal pipe.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claim 20 is rejected as obvious over Zagrodnik in view of Nace (USP 6,120,167). Claim 20 depends from claim 14. Nace is cited as allegedly rendering obvious the use of a lamp as a license lamp. However, Nace does not remedy the deficiencies of Zagrodnik as discussed with reference to claims 1 and 14. Hence, claim 20 is not rendered obvious by Zagrodnik and Nace.

Conclusion

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

By: 

Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No. 36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: April 13, 2005

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701